

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**


<p>SHIGE TAKIGUCHI, FUMI NONAKA, )          MITSUAKI TAKITA, KAORUKO KOIZUMI, )          TATSURO SAKAI, SHIZUKO ISHIMORI, )          YOKO HATANO, YUKO NAKAMURA, )          HIDEHITO MIURA, YOSHIKO TAZAKI, )          MASAACKI MORIYA, HATSUNE HATANO, )          SATORU MORIYA, HIDENAO TAKAMA, )          SHIGERU KURISU, SAKA ONO, )          KAZUHIRO MATSUMOTO, KAYA )          HATANAKA, HIROKA YAMAJIRI, )          KIIYOHARU YAMAMOTO, JUNKO )          YAMAMOTO, KOICHI INOUE, AKIKO )          NARUSE, TOSHIMASA NOMURA, and )          RITSU YURIKUSA, Individually and )          on Behalf of All Others Similarly )          Situated, )    <div style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs, )</div>           vs. )            MRI INTERNATIONAL, INC., EDWIN J )          FUJINAGA, JUNZO SUZUKI, PAUL )          MUSASHI SUZUKI, LVT, INC., dba )          STERLING ESCROW, and DOES 1-500, )    <div style="text-align: center;">Defendants. )</div> </p>	<p>2:13-cv-01183-HDM-VCF</p> <p>ORDER</p>
--	--

Before the court is the Suzukis' renewed motion to permit the sale of property located at 1550 Hoaaaina St., Honolulu, Hawaii, for a price of seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars (#253). The plaintiffs objected to the sale on several grounds, principal among

1 those that the proposed sales price was substantially less than the  
2 actual value of the property. At a hearing on December 15, 2015,  
3 the court deferred ruling on the motion pending submission of an  
4 appraisal by the Suzukis as to the value of the property. The  
5 court also allowed plaintiffs to submit their own appraisal. The  
6 court directed the Suzukis to file an appraisal on or before  
7 January 25, 2016. The Suzukis have failed to do so. Plaintiffs,  
8 however, have filed an appraisal, which values 1550 Hoaaaina St. at  
9 one million one hundred and forty-five thousand dollars (Doc.  
10 #354). Accordingly, on the basis of the only appraisal before the  
11 court, which shows the appraised value is substantially greater  
12 than the proposed sales price, the court is not satisfied that the  
13 proposed sales price is reasonably related to the value of the  
14 property. The renewed motion to permit the sale of 1550 Hoaaaina  
15 St. (#253) is therefore denied without prejudice.

16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17 DATED: This 4th day of February, 2016.

18 

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28